

## CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Trevor Hackett	Team: Squad #08	CCRB Case #: 202100385	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Saturday, 01/16/2021 9:50 PM	Location of Incident: Intersection of New Lots Avenue and Warwick Street	18 Mo. SOL 7/16/2022	Precinct: 75		
Date/Time CV Reported Mon, 01/18/2021 1:04 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: Call Processing System	Date/Time Received at CCRB Mon, 01/18/2021 1:04 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Witness(es)	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. PO Matthew Mccurry	20597	958897	075 PCT
2. PO Joseph Vigiano	19363	962152	075 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A . PO Matthew Mccurry	Abuse: Police Officer Matthew Mccurry stopped § 87(2)(b)	
B . PO Joseph Vigiano	Abuse: Police Officer Joseph Vigiano stopped § 87(2)(b)	
C . PO Matthew Mccurry	Force: Police Officer Matthew Mccurry used physical force against § 87(2)(b)	
D . PO Matthew Mccurry	Abuse: Police Officer Matthew Mccurry frisked § 87(2)(b)	
E . PO Matthew Mccurry	Abuse: Police Officer Matthew Mccurry searched § 87(2)(b)	
F . PO Joseph Vigiano	Abuse: Police Officer Joseph Vigiano failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.	
G . PO Matthew Mccurry	Abuse: Police Officer Matthew Mccurry failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.	
§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)		

### Case Summary

On January 18, 2021, § 87(2)(b) filed the following complaint on behalf of his 13-year-old son, § 87(2)(b) via the CCRB's Call Processing System.

On January 16, 2021, at approximately 9:50 PM, § 87(2)(b) was attending a friend's birthday party with his 10-year-old sister, § 87(2)(b) at § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) left the party and began walking home when PO Matthew McCurry and PO Joseph Vigiano of the 75<sup>th</sup> Precinct pulled up next to § 87(2)(b) fled from the officers. PO McCurry caught up with § 87(2)(b) on the adjacent street corner and allegedly lifted him off the ground and slammed him onto the hood of a police vehicle (**Allegations A and B: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)** **Allegation C: Force, § 87(2)(g)** The use of force against § 87(2)(b) is being analyzed separately from the stop (see below). PO McCurry then frisked and searched § 87(2)(b) (**Allegations D and E: Abuse of authority, § 87(2)(g)** § 87(2)(b) was then released. Neither PO McCurry nor PO Vigiano provided § 87(2)(b) with a business card (**Allegations F and G: Abuse of Authority, § 87(2)(g)** No summons or arrest resulted from this incident. § 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)

BWC footage was obtained from PO Vigiano. The footage is located in IA #40 and is summarized in IA #67 (**Board Review 01, 02**).

### Findings and Recommendations

**Allegation A: Abuse of Authority – Police Officer Matthew McCurry stopped § 87(2)(b)**  
**Allegation B: Abuse of Authority – Police Officer Joseph Vigiano stopped § 87(2)(b)**  
**Allegation D: Abuse of Authority – Police Officer Matthew McCurry frisked § 87(2)(b)**  
**Allegation E: Abuse of Authority – Police Officer Matthew McCurry searched § 87(2)(b)**  
-.

BWC from PO Vigiano shows, beginning at 00:00, visible on the media player at the bottom of the screen, PO Vigiano and PO McCurry are in their vehicle across the intersection from the bodega at the corner of New Lots Avenue and Ashford Street. At 00:27, the officers pull up next to a group of individuals standing on the sidewalk outside the bodega and begin driving slowly next to them. § 87(2)(b) (backwards black baseball cap) can be seen walking on the sidewalk ahead of the police vehicle. At 00:33, § 87(2)(b) stops walking and turns towards the officers. PO Vigiano stops the police vehicle, and PO McCurry exits and approaches § 87(2)(b) Upon doing so, § 87(2)(b) runs from PO McCurry, who chases him. PO Vigiano stays in the police vehicle, drives ahead, and pulls in front of § 87(2)(b) at the next street corner, who is ultimately stopped. At 01:03, PO McCurry turns § 87(2)(b) around so that they are facing one another and reaches down towards § 87(2)(b) jacket pockets. PO McCurry then unzips § 87(2)(b) § 87(2)(b) winter coat and continues to reach towards § 87(2)(b) lower torso. It is unclear whether PO McCurry enters any of § 87(2)(b) pockets at any point. It is unclear whether anything is removed from § 87(2)(b) pockets and there is no mention of any object which may have been detected by PO McCurry. When asked by PO Vigiano why he ran from officers, § 87(2)(b) says that he does not know. PO McCurry then asks § 87(2)(b) “Who had the gun over there.” § 87(2)(b) responds, “The one with the orange jacket” and points back toward the corner where he first encountered the officers. PO Vigiano relays this information over the radio and the officers get back in their car and begin to canvass for the individual (**Board Review 01**).

The stop report prepared by PO McCurry states “At t/p/o, undersigned did observe the person listed with a heavy weighted down object in his jacket pocket loitering around a commercial

establishment with a large group of other individuals. Upon undersigned stepping out of the vehicle, one of those individuals did alert the subject that was stopped that police were in the area. The subject's demeanor immediately did change, looked nervous, and bladed his body away from the police. These actions raised the suspicion of officers that he was in possession of a firearm. Upon exiting the vehicle, the subject fled on foot after police announced themselves. Subject was apprehended and frisked for a firearm. No firearm was recovered, and the subject was let go. Before being free to go, subject did say it wasn't him with the firearm, it was the kid with the orange bubble jacket who was part of the group loitering around" **(Board Review 05)**.

§ 87(2)(b) statement was generally consistent with the BWC footage. On January 16, 2021, at approximately 9:50 PM, § 87(2)(b) was attending a friend's birthday party at § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn. After several hours, § 87(2)(b) his sister, § 87(2)(b) and his friend, § 87(2)(b) left the party and were standing outside the front door of the building. § 87(2)(b) had his caseless iPhone XR and his glasses in the front left pocket of his pants. There was a group of four to six teenage males standing on the sidewalk approximately 5 to 10 feet away from § 87(2)(b) in front of a corner store located at 761 New Lots Avenue. This group of boys had been at the party earlier but had left together. Someone had told § 87(2)(b) that this group of teenagers had been harassing people inside the corner store and that someone had called the police. § 87(2)(b) spoke to an individual named § 87(2)(b) for approximately three minutes and then began walking home with his sister. § 87(2)(b) did not interact with anyone else before beginning to walk home. § 87(2)(b) and § 87(2)(b) did not touch each other or hand anything between them while they were speaking. As soon as § 87(2)(b) started walking, PO McCurry and PO Vigiano pulled up next to him in an unmarked vehicle. § 87(2)(b) stopped briefly as he thought the officers might get out of their vehicle. § 87(2)(b) continued walking and PO McCurry and PO Vigiano slowly pulled up next to § 87(2)(b). § 87(2)(b) turned around and saw PO McCurry exit the passenger side of the car. PO Vigiano "flinched" at § 87(2)(b) as if he was going to run at him. In response, § 87(2)(b) ran and stopped when PO Vigiano cut him off at the next corner. Neither PO McCurry nor PO Vigiano spoke to § 87(2)(b) including issuing him any commands before or while he was running. When § 87(2)(b) reached the corner and saw that PO Vigiano had cut him off, he stopped running and put his hands in the air to signal to the officers that he was surrendering. PO McCurry grabbed § 87(2)(b) by his shirt and his coat, lifted him off the ground, and slammed him onto the hood of a parked car (use of force is addressed in allegation C). PO McCurry patted down § 87(2)(b) upper body over his clothing and the area around his front pants pockets. PO McCurry then put his hands inside § 87(2)(b) front pants pockets but did not remove any items **(Board Review 03)**.

§ 87(2)(b) statement was generally consistent with § 87(2)(b) as well as the BWC. She stated that PO McCurry did not enter § 87(2)(b) pockets at any point, though in a follow up statement, she said that PO McCurry entered § 87(2)(b) front and back jacket pockets, his front sweater pocket, and both of his jacket pockets **(Board Review 04)**.

PO McCurry stated that he and PO Vigiano were on routine patrol on New Lots Avenue and were one block east of Ashford Street in Brooklyn, where a large group of 15-20 teenagers had just come outside from a party. The location is known for violence and PO McCurry has made several gun arrests there. There are frequently parties at this location on weekend nights, so PO McCurry routinely stops to observe the activities there during these times. PO McCurry and PO Vigiano were in their vehicle, an unmarked black ford fusion, observing the group to make sure no fights broke out, which PO McCurry stated has happened at that location in the past. The group of kids was blocking the north side of the sidewalk, and several of them were running back and forth across the street, through traffic. The officers were observing the group from five to seven car lengths away. PO McCurry, who was sitting in the passenger seat, had a clear line of sight to the group. The area



was well lit and the group was standing in front of a bodega on the corner. There was no 911 call or event generated for any incident at the location. The officers did not receive any information over the radio about this group. PO McCurry did not have prior familiarity with anyone in the group on this date. When asked whether any of the individuals committing any offenses or violations, PO McCurry stated that the group blocking the sidewalk and the individuals running across the street through traffic constituted disorderly conduct and jaywalking. § 87(2)(b) was one of the individuals blocking the sidewalk and as such, was engaged in disorderly conduct. PO McCurry did not recall if any pedestrians had to step into the roadway to get around the group. PO McCurry's attention was drawn to § 87(2)(b) due to a weighted down object in his front right jacket pocket, one corner of which appeared to come to a narrow point, which PO McCurry believed was consistent with the barrel of a firearm. PO McCurry did not observe the outline of a gun and could not provide any details about the object's size. § 87(2)(b) was wearing a black, light bubble coat at the time. PO McCurry was able to recognize this due to trainings on how to recognize firearms and believed that the object was too heavy on one corner to be a phone. An individual in the group appeared to whisper to § 87(2)(b) that officers were in the area. PO McCurry could see the individual's mouth moving as he spoke to § 87(2)(b) but could not hear what was said. § 87(2)(b) eyes widened, and he appeared nervous. § 87(2)(b) looked at the police vehicle, "bladed" his body and began walking in one direction, then doubled back and began walking the opposite way. PO McCurry did not recall what, if anything, § 87(2)(b) was doing with his hands at the time. The officers pulled up to the group and PO McCurry exited the vehicle in order to approach § 87(2)(b) and frisk his pocket area for a possible firearm. § 87(2)(b) immediately fled from the location, which further raised PO McCurry's suspicion that he was carrying a firearm.

PO McCurry acknowledged frisking § 87(2)(b) right jacket pocket area where he had observed the object. PO McCurry felt a heavy, hard object but could not tell what it was because there was "material" in the way and believed that it may have been in an inside pocket. PO McCurry unzipped § 87(2)(b) jacket and patted down the inside of the pocket, at which point he determined that the object, which had a rectangular shape, was not a firearm. PO McCurry did not recall reaching into any of § 87(2)(b) pockets at any point. PO McCurry did not recall frisking any other area. Unprompted, § 87(2)(b) told PO McCurry that he did not have a gun. PO McCurry asked who had the gun, to which § 87(2)(b) responded that the individual in the orange bubble coat did. PO McCurry saw the individual in the orange coat when he first approached the group but did not make any observation that he was armed. Aside from this statement, PO McCurry did not have any information or make any observation that any of the other individuals at the location had a firearm (**Board Review 06**).

PO Vigiano's statement was somewhat inconsistent with PO McCurry's. PO Vigiano stated the group of teenagers was being loud but not loud enough to constitute a violation. The individuals were standing in a tight circle and crowding the sidewalk but were not committing any violation that PO Vigiano observed. When asked if the officers observed anything specifically which prompted the officers to approach the group, PO Vigiano stated that the individuals were acting like a typical group of middle school aged boys, being boisterous, making jokes, and "possibly up to something mischievous in which they're not trying to show a teacher." PO Vigiano did not make any observation which led him to believe that § 87(2)(b) or anyone else in the group was armed and did not observe and weapon shaped bulges in any of the individuals' clothing. PO Vigiano did not recall whether PO McCurry mentioned that he thought any of the individuals were armed. PO Vigiano and PO McCurry spoke about what the demeanor of the group, what they could possibly be doing, whether they knew anyone in the group, which PO Vigiano did not. PO Vigiano and PO McCurry discussed the possibility of someone in the group potentially having a firearm. When asked if this discussion was focused on any particular individual, PO Vigiano stated that it

was not, and that the officers always discuss the possibility of a firearm being present whenever they decide to engage a group of people. PO Vigiano stated that something did not feel right about the group but was unsure of why they felt this way. Since the officers “did not have anything concrete to go off of,” They decided to approach the individuals and ask them what was going on to further investigate.

After 30 to 60 seconds of observing the group, the individuals noticed the officers’ vehicle as it approached and several individuals “bobbed and weaved” their heads in order to see who was inside and several of the individuals, including § 87(2)(b) “bladed” their bodies away from the officers. As soon as PO McCurry opened the passenger door, and identified himself, the demeanor of the individuals changed. The individuals told each other that the police were there, their eyes “lit up” and they “looked like they just got caught doing something.” Aside from the individuals blading their bodies away from the officers, there were no other specific actions which elevated PO Vigiano’s suspicion, though he stated that § 87(2)(b) who was 15-20 feet away from the officers and wearing a dark jacket, appeared to walk behind an individual. PO Vigiano stated that individuals do this when they have something in their pocket that they are trying to hide. When asked whether it appeared § 87(2)(b) did this to conceal himself or whether it appeared that he was just walking through the crowd, PO Vigiano stated that it appeared he appeared to do so to hide from the officers. PO Vigiano did not recall whether there was any communication between PO McCurry and § 87(2)(b) when he exited the police vehicle. PO Vigiano remained in the car when PO McCurry exited and did not have any communication with any of the individuals. PO Vigiano did not activate the turret lights or sirens when he pulled up to the group and stated that the officers gave the individuals no indication that anyone was being stopped.

PO Vigiano acknowledged that PO McCurry frisked § 87(2)(b) though he could not recall specifically where he was frisked. He believed PO McCurry did this because the officers had discussed the possibility of one of the individuals in the group having a firearm before they initiated the encounter. PO Vigiano clarified that aside from § 87(2)(b) turning his body and walking away from the officers, there was nothing else he observed which led him to believe § 87(2)(b) was armed prior to PO McCurry getting out of the vehicle. At the point when § 87(2)(b) was stopped and frisked, PO Vigiano did not make any additional observation that he was armed or that he had anything in his pockets indicative of a heavy object. PO McCurry’s frisk yielded negative results. PO Vigiano was not aware of PO McCurry searching § 87(2)(b) at any point and did not know whether he unzipped his jacket (**Board Review 07**).

An officer may stop a person when the officer has a reasonable suspicion that the person has committed, is committing, or is about to commit a felony or misdemeanor. *People v. DeBour*, 40 N.Y. 2d 210, 233 (1976) (**Board Review 10**).

A defendant's flight in response to an approach by the police, combined with other specific circumstances indicating that the suspect may be engaged in criminal activity, may give rise to reasonable suspicion, the necessary predicate for police pursuit. *People v. Parker*, 32 N.Y.3d 49 (**Board Review 11**).

In *People v. Rose*, 155 A.D.3d 1322, the defendant fled the scene and was ultimately stopped by officers after they attempted to approach him. The court determined that even if the officers had founded suspicion to initiate a level two encounter, the defendant’s flight would not have elevated the situation to a level three encounter given that the officers approach of the defendant was based on the brisk pace he was walking in proximity to a reported stolen vehicle. The defendant therefore had the constitutional right to be left alone and disregard the officer’s command to stop (**Board Review 16**).

An officer may frisk an individual when they reasonably suspect that the individual may be armed and present a risk of harm to the officer. If an apparent weapon is revealed during a frisk, a limited search may be conducted only of the area where the apparent weapon was discovered *People v. DeBour*, 40 N.Y.2d 210 (1976) (**Board Review 11**).

In *People v. Stevenson*, 779 N.Y.S.2d 498 (2004), a police detective observed a bulge in the center of the waistband of an individual walking on the street. The detective saw the defendant adjust his clothing around the bulge several times. The detective did not indicate that the bulge had the outline of a weapon, and he was unable to describe it in any further detail. Because these observations were readily susceptible of an innocent as well as a guilty explanation, the court found these observations to insufficient to permit the detective to frisk the individual (**Board Review 17**).

In *United States v. Stokes*, 2019 U.S. Dist., the court determined that, an officer unzipping a defendant's jacket following a frisk in which a possible firearm was detected, constituted a search (**Board Review 15**).

BWC footage is inconclusive as to what § 87(2)(b) or the other individuals are doing prior to PO McCurry exiting the vehicle and § 87(2)(b) immediately fleeing the location. PO McCurry and PO Vigiano's statements were somewhat inconsistent in regard to what occurred during this period in time. PO McCurry stated that he observed § 87(2)(b) and the other individuals were disrupting pedestrian traffic by crowding the sidewalk, which constituted disorderly conduct. However, PO Vigiano stated that while the individuals were crowding the sidewalk, they were not committing any offenses which he observed. PO McCurry stated that he observed a weighted down object in § 87(2)(b) front right jacket pocket, one corner of which appeared to come to a narrow point, which PO McCurry believed was consistent with the barrel of a firearm. However, PO McCurry could not provide any further details about the shape or size of the object. PO McCurry stated that once § 87(2)(b) was aware that officers were watching him, he bladed his body, walked in one direction before doubling back and walking the opposite direction. PO McCurry stated that he approached § 87(2)(b) with the intention of frisking him for a firearm based on the object he had observed and his suspicious behavior. While PO Vigiano stated that § 87(2)(b) bladed his body away from officers and appeared to walk behind someone when he became aware of the officers, he did not make any observation of the weighted down object PO McCurry mentioned in his statement or his stop report. PO Vigiano further stated that while the officers routinely discuss the possibility a firearm being present anytime they approach any group of individuals, the officers did not have a concrete reason to approach § 87(2)(b) and the other members of the group, only saying that "something felt off."

Although PO McCurry stated that the approached § 87(2)(b) with the purpose of frisking him for a firearm, his description of the object he observed in § 87(2)(b) pocket was vague, specifically lacking details of the shape or side of the object. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

After apprehending § 87(2)(b) PO McCurry did not make any additional observations indicating that the alleged object he observed was a firearm prior to conducting a frisk. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b) alleged that PO McCurry entered his front pants pockets after he patted him down. BWC footage was inconclusive as to whether this occurred. PO McCurry denied that this occurred, and PO Vigiano had no recollection of this happening. § 87(2)(b) provided conflicting statements as to whether PO McCurry entered any of § 87(2)(b) pockets. However, BWC footage does capture PO McCurry unzipping § 87(2)(b) coat. PO McCurry acknowledged doing this as because during his frisk of the jacket pocket, he was unable to determine whether the object he observed was a firearm due to “material” being in the way. He therefore decided to unzip the coat to frisk the pocket from the inside, at which point he determined that the unknown object was rectangular in shape and not a firearm.

§ 87(2)(g)

**Allegation C – Force: Police Officer Matthew McCurry used force against § 87(2)(b)**

BWC footage from PO Vigiano shows, at 00:45, visible on the media player at the bottom of the screen, PO Vigiano cuts off § 87(2)(b) path with the police vehicle. PO McCurry and § 87(2)(b) appear on the left side of the frame and PO McCurry has his arms wrapped around § 87(2)(b) torso. § 87(2)(b) appears to be signaling that he is giving up as his arms are raised and extended to his sides and his palms are open. PO McCurry then turns § 87(2)(b) around so that he is facing away from him, grabs the back of his coat, and pushes him onto the hood of the police vehicle. As PO Vigiano gets out of the vehicle, § 87(2)(b) can be seen laying face down on the hood of the vehicle and his right leg is off the ground. § 87(2)(b) then leans back, puts his feet on the ground and lifts himself off the hood. The footage shows that PO McCurry does not lift § 87(2)(b) into the air at any point, nor does he throw him down on the hood of the vehicle.

§ 87(2)(b) statement was somewhat inconsistent with the BWC. He stated that when PO McCurry caught up with him, he grabbed him by his shirt and his coat about his waist and collar area, lifted him off the ground, and “slammed” him onto the hood of a parked car. PO McCurry did not say anything to § 87(2)(b) before he picked him up. § 87(2)(b) did not make any other movements aside from putting his hands in the air. § 87(2)(b) landed on the hood of the car on the front-left side of his body. § 87(2)(b) was not making any movements when PO McCurry picked him up or when he was on the hood of the car (**Board Review 03**).

§ 87(2)(b) did not witness PO McCurry lift § 87(2)(b) and drop him on the hood of the car, though she stated that she heard what she believed to be § 87(2)(b) hitting the car (**Board Review 04**).

PO Vigiano stated that once he cut off § 87(2)(b) he put his hands out “like an airplane” so signal that he was surrendering. PO Vigiano did not have any recollection of PO McCurry lifting § 87(2)(b) or taking any action that would put him on the hood of the police vehicle (**Board Review 07**).



PO McCurry stated that he grabbed § 87(2)(b) and began to escort him towards the police vehicle to prevent him from fleeing again. PO McCurry was unsure how § 87(2)(b) ended up on the hood of the vehicle and denied that he took any action which would have caused this. PO McCurry was shown BWC footage of § 87(2)(b) laying on his chest on the hood of the police vehicle with his feet visibly off the ground. PO McCurry did not alter his testimony and speculated that § 87(2)(b) may have jumped onto the hood himself as a result of being very excited and nervous during the interaction **(Board Review 06)**.

NYPD Patrol Guide, Procedure 221-01 states that officers may use force when it is reasonable to put someone in custody, or to prevent their escape from custody. In all cases, the application or use of force must be reasonable under the circumstances **(Board Review 08)**.

BWC footage shows that PO McCurry does not pick up § 87(2)(b) and slam him onto the hood of the vehicle. However, PO McCurry does push § 87(2)(b) onto the hood of the vehicle. § 87(2)(b) positioning on the vehicle seems to suggest that due to the low level of the hood, PO McCurry pushed him far enough towards the windshield that his feet were lifted off the ground by the front of the car. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

**Allegation F – Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Joseph Vigiano failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.**

**Allegation G – Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Matthew McCurry failed to provide § 87(2)(b) with a business card.**

BWC from PO Vigiano shows, at 01:39, § 87(2)(b) tells PO McCurry that an individual wearing an orange jacket has a gun and points toward the corner where officers first encountered him. PO Vigiano relays this information over the radio and he and PO McCurry get back in their vehicle and immediately begin canvassing for the individual, whom they ultimately did not find **(Board Review 01)**.

Statements from PO McCurry and PO Vigiano were consistent. They denied offering § 87(2)(b) a business card because they immediately started canvassing for the individual with the firearm which he had pointed out **(Board Review 06, 07)**.

New York City Administrative Code 14-174, states that officers are to offer a business card at the conclusion of a stop. Per Patrol Guide Procedure 203-09, officers are to offer a business card at the conclusion of a stop except when exigent circumstances are present. Examples of exigent circumstances include physical resistance, flight, imminent danger of physical injury or damage to property, or other factors that may make such a procedure impractical **(Board Review 09)**.

Neither PO Vigiano nor PO McCurry provided § 87(2)(b) with a business card and did not do so because they immediately started searching for the armed individual that § 87(2)(b) had just pointed out. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g), § 87(4-b)



**Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories**

- This is the first complaint to which § 87(2)(b) has been a party (**Board Review 12**).
- PO McCurry has been a member-of-service for six years and has been named as a subject in eight additional CCRB cases and fifteen additional allegations, none of which were substantiated. § 87(2)(g)
- PO Vigiano has been a member of service for five years and has been named as a subject in four additional cases and ten additional allegations, none of which have been substantiated.

**Mediation, Civil, and Criminal Histories**

- This complaint was not suitable for mediation.
- As of July 26, 2021, the New York City Office of the Comptroller has no record of a Notice of Claim being filed in regards this to complaint (**Board Review 13**).
- [§ 87(2)(b)] [§§ 86(1)(3)&(4)] [§ 87(2)(c)]

Squad: 8

Investigator: Trevor Hackett Inv. Trevor Hackett 5/13/2022  
Signature Print Title & Name Date

Squad Leader: Ethan De Angelo IM Ethan De Angelo 5/13/2022  
Signature Print Title & Name Date

Reviewer: Signature Print Title & Name Date